Regionwide Planning
A Collaborative Approach

A Proposal by the Regional Planning Committee

Committee Members

Paul Battisti, Supervisor, County of Napa, *Chair*
Linda Perry, Councilmember, City of San Leandro, *Vice Chair*

Jane Baker, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Brady Bevis, Supervisor, County of Marin
Dorothy Breiner, Former Vice Mayor, City of San Rafael
Michael Cale, Supervisor, County of Sonoma
William D. Davis, LAFCO, County of San Mateo
Paul DeFalco, Public Interest Representative
Ann Draper, Director of Economic Development, City of Fremont
Sandra E. Elles, Councilmember, City of Cotati
David A. Fleming, Mayor, City of Vacaville
Marge F. Gibson Haskell, Economic Development
Millie Greenberg, Vice Mayor, Town of Danville
Mary Griffin, Supervisor, County of San Mateo
Gary Hambly, Building Industry Association
Greg Harper, Councilmember, City of Emeryville
Stana Hearne, League of Women Voters
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club
Mary King, Supervisor, County of Alameda
Claire L. Mack, Councilmember, City of San Mateo
Jean McCown, Councilmember, City of Palo Alto
Karin Mohr, Councilmember, City of Pleasanton
Larry Orman, Greenbelt Alliance
Jim Pachl, Bay Conservation and Development Commission
Steven A. Roberti, COLAB
Guillermo Rodriguez, Latino Issues Forum
Ed Solomon, Mayor, City of Napa
William H. Steele, Chevron USA, Inc.
Dezie Woods-Jones, Councilmember, City of Oakland
Stan Williams, Santa Clara Valley Water District

February 1994

Regionwide Planning
A Collaborative Approach

Locally elected officials throughout the Bay Area have been seeking effective solutions to traffic congestion, housing affordability, air pollution, loss of farm and open space lands, and other problems that impact but also transcend the boundaries of individual cities and counties. Recently, improving the Bay Area's economy has been added to this list of region-wide concerns. Clearly, one major impediment is money to fund needed facilities, services and infrastructure, and offset the revenue-driven planning policies that have shaped development in recent years. In addition, however, the present fragmented planning system needs modifying to properly manage growth in an era of economic retrenching and fiscal constraint. The challenge is to create a planning process that respects both the individual and the shared characteristics of the region's localities and subregions. Such a strategy can only be developed from the local level up.

For more than five years, ABAG's members have been working to develop a more effective approach to coordinated planning in the Bay Area. Charged with updating the regional plan, they chose to focus first on determining specific broad-based policy objectives and then on developing the means of accomplishing them. Meeting those objectives resulted in the publication of "A Proposed Land Use Policy Framework for the San Francisco Bay Area" in 1990, the endorsement of the "Platform on Growth Management" by ABAG's General Assembly in 1992, and the subsequent development of the other components of this package.

ABAG's policymakers recognize that each city and county has its own identity and needs as well as a role to play in any subregional or regional scheme. They support and seek to build upon an emerging trend toward subregional planning and coordination. Many ABAG leaders have participated in successful multi-jurisdictional efforts such as congestion management agencies, as well as on regional agencies' boards. Their collective experience is reflected in the planning program this package describes.

The documents included here set forward a collaborative, incentive-driven planning approach tailored to the unique needs of the Bay Area. The emphasis is on coordinated multi-jurisdictional planning at the subregional level to address regional goals and objectives within the context of local needs. Regional agencies are called on to develop consistent programs, as well as financial and other incentives needed to stimulate participation. With these tools we are now equipped to begin developing, collaboratively, the local, subregional and regional plans and programs that will enable the Bay Area to achieve its goals.

Contents

Regional Goals & Objectives

In attaining a coordinated conservation and development strategy for the San Francisco Bay Area, localities, subregional planning units, and regional agencies should be guided by and work in accord with the following goals and objectives:

(a) Encourage a pattern of compact city centered growth in the urban areas of the San Francisco Bay Area, with a balance of land uses guided and or assisted relating compatibles in order to preserve surrounding open space and agricultural lands, as well as environmentally sensitive lands.

(b) Direct growth, whenever possible to areas adequately serviced or available to transportation networks, but not limited to, streets, roads, water, solid waste disposal, and sewage treatment, and where adequate measures can be undertaken, and encourage other growth to adequately serviced areas.

(c) Encourage development patterns and projects that discourage long range or large-scale commuting and encourage residential access to employment, shopping, and recreation by means of our mass transit.

(d) Encourage new growth boundaries and limits and control urban development with urban open space boundaries.

(e) Encourage the provision of housing within each county of the San Francisco Bay Area with a range of types, densities and affordability and a socially diverse environment to accommodate current and future workers and households.

(f) Encourage the long-term protection and enhancement of agricultural land, of especially sensitive areas and open space, and of other irreplaceable natural resources necessary to the health, economic and well-being of present and future generations, and to the sustainable ecology of the region.

(g) Encourage economic development within the region to provide job opportunities and break problems, to encourage the use of local, regional and statewide California products in the global marketplace, and to help provide the resources necessary to cover high environmental, infrastructure, transportation, and other costs.

Regional Goals & Objectives

In creating a coordinated conservation and development strategy for the San Francisco Bay Area, localities, subregional planning bodies, and regional agencies shall be guided by and seek to achieve consistency with all of the following goals and objectives:

(a) Encourage a pattern of compact city-centered growth in the urban areas of the San Francisco Bay Area, with a balance of land uses guided into or around existing communities in order to preserve surrounding open space and agricultural land, as well as environmentally sensitive areas.

(b) Direct growth whenever possible to where infrastructure capacity is available or committed including, but not limited to, freeway, transit, water, solid waste disposal, and sewage treatment, and where natural resources will not be overburdened, and discourage urban growth in unincorporated areas.

(c) Encourage development patterns and policies that discourage long distance single-occupant automobile commuting and increase resident access to employment, shopping, and recreation by transit or non-auto means.

(d) Encourage firm growth boundaries and direct and permit urban development only within these growth boundaries.

(e) Encourage the provision of housing within each county of the San Francisco Bay Area with a range of types, densities and affordability and a suitable living environment to accommodate current and future workers and households.

(f) Encourage the long-term protection and enhancement of agricultural land, ecologically sensitive areas and open space, and of other irreplaceable natural resources necessary to the health, economy and well-being of present and future generations, and to the sustainable ecology of the region.

(g) Encourage economic development within the region to provide jobs for current and future residents, to increase the tax base, to support and enhance California's position in the global marketplace, and to help provide the resources necessary to meet vital environmental, housing, transportation, and other needs.

Procedure for Coordinated Planning

Developing an effective coordinated conservation and development strategy for the Bay Area requires a cooperative approach. The approach is to build from the local level up and not down, and therefore, to conserve on power.

The recommended procedure calls for localities in each county to prepare strategies, consistent consistent with the subelements of the each objectives. The issues to be addressed by these strategies include:

- Locations and densities of urban development
- Natural resources preservation and enhancement
- Mobility by rail, buses, automobile, bicycle, pedestrian and transportation modes
- Housing supply and affordability
- Economic vitality

Once developed, the subregional strategies will serve as the building blocks of coordinated planning in the Bay Area.

Regional agencies assume a supportive role throughout the process. They are to provide perspective and assisting strategies to localities and the subregional planning bodies.

Procedure for Coordinated Planning

Developing an effective, coordinated conservation and development strategy for the Bay Area requires a collaborative approach. This approach is to build from the local level up and rely on incentives, not mandates, to achieve its goals.

The recommended procedure calls for localities to work together to prepare subregional strategies consistent with the achievement of regional objectives. The issues to be addressed by these subregional strategies include:

- Location and intensity of urban development
- Natural resource protection and management
- Mobility by car, transit, telecommunications and nonmotorized means
- Housing supply and affordability
- Economic vitality

Once developed, the subregional strategies shall serve as the building blocks of coordinated planning in the Bay Area.

Regional agencies assume a supportive role throughout this planning effort. They are to provide incentives and technical assistance to localities and the subregional planning bodies.

Phase 1: Develop Coordinated Subregional Policies

- Subregional planning bodies, working with local councils and boards, staffs and public input, select policies appropriate to local and subregional conditions, and achievement of regional goals and objectives.

- Adjacent subregional planning bodies share information; anticipate and seek early resolution of potential conflicts; collaborate on policies affecting subregional boundaries; communicate with/seek assistance and comments from regional agencies.

- Regional agencies, working with representatives of subregional planning bodies, support and facilitate the process; identify, and/or develop incentives; promote statewide fiscal and other reforms; provide tools and technical assistance; share information and creative ideas; help to build consensus and resolve conflicts between sub-regions.

Phase 2: Develop Subregional Implementation Programs

- Subregional bodies, working closely with local jurisdictions, develop programs to implement subregional strategies. Implementation mechanisms will be needed at both the subregional and local levels.

For example, to improve mobility and housing supply, a subregion could focus infrastructure investments in a specified transportation corridor. Individual jurisdictions could support that action by ensuring that zoning ordinances and development programs require higher residential densities and mixed-use development within 1/4 mile of that corridor.

- Regional agencies continue to support, share information, develop incentives, promote state reforms, resolve conflicts and conduct public education and outreach. The goal is to facilitate collaborative planning geared to regional goals and objectives between local jurisdictions and adjacent subregions.

Phase 3: Subregional Self-Certification/Development of Regional Plan

- Subregional bodies adopt growth management strategies (policies + implementation programs) and self-certify compliance with regional growth management objectives.

- Subregional bodies circulate strategies to all other subregional bodies for review, comment, and conflict resolution; and to ABAG for inclusion in regional plan.

- Regional agencies, working with representatives of subregional bodies, use completed subregional strategies to construct regional plan.

Phase 1: Develop Coordinated Subregional Policies

- Subregional planning teams, working with local councils and boards, with public input, select policies appropriate to local and subregional situations, and achievement of regional goals and objectives.

- Adjacent subregional planning teams share information; anticipate and deal early resolution of potential conflicts; collaborate on policies affecting subregional boundaries; communicate regularly with and support their regional agencies.

- Regional agencies, working with representatives of subregional planning bodies, support and facilitate the process, identify and develop incentives, promote alternative fiscal and other reforms, provide tools and technical assistance, share information and convene meetings to build consensus and resolve conflicts between subregions.

Phase 2: Develop Subregional Implementation Programs

- Subregional teams, working closely with local land boards, develop programs to implement subregional strategies. Implementation mechanisms are needed at both the subregional and local levels.

Implementation mechanisms and strategies include a subregional land use plan, a subregional capital improvements program, a specific plan, performance standards, subdivision control, incentives to encourage the phasing of timeshare and development projects, regional housing mechanisms, mediation and interagency agreements within the subregion or sub-corridor.

- Subregional agencies continue to support, share information, develop incentives, promote new relations, resolve conflicts and complete policy research and consensus. The goal is to facilitate coordination in planning, assure regional goals and objectives, conserve local jurisdictions and achieve subregional.

Phase 3: Subregional Self-Certification/Development of Regional Plan

- Subregional teams adopt a growth management strategy (policies & implementation programs) and self-certify consistency with regional growth management objectives.

- Subregional teams consider new goals in all other subregional teams for review, comment, and conflict resolution, and to adopt the subregional plan.

- Regional agencies, working with representatives of subregional teams, use subregional strategies to develop a regional plan.

Guidelines For Establishing Subregional Planning Bodies

A Proposal by the Subcommittee on Implementing Subregional Planning

Subcommittee Members

Linda Perry, Councilmember, City of San Leandro, *Chair*
Marge Gibson Haskell, Former Councilmember, City of Oakland, *Vice Chair*

Jane Baker, Mayor, City of San Mateo
Paul Battisti, Supervisor, County of Napa
Brady Bevis, Supervisor, County of Marin
Dorothy Breiner, Vice Mayor, City of San Rafael
Ben Collins, Former Councilmember, City of Healdsburg
William D. Davis, LAFCO, County of San Mateo
Paul DeFalco, Public Interest Representative
Millie Greenberg, Councilmember, Town of Danville
Greg Harper, Councilmember, City of Emeryville
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club
Jean McCown, Mayor, City of Palo Alto
Tom Powers, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa
Stan Williams, Santa Clara Valley Water District

Endorsed by the Executive Board of the Association of Bay Area Governments
February 1993

Guidelines For Establishing Subregional Planning Bodies

In March and October of 1992, delegates to the Association of Bay Area Governments' General Assembly adopted a series of principles that together form a Bay Area Platform on Growth Management. The Platform articulates a commitment to coordinated, inter-jurisdictional action. It recognizes that achieving goals such as protecting the Bay, sustaining agriculture, improving air quality, maintaining a healthy economy, and rejuvenating the urban core will require region-wide cooperation.

A key feature of the adopted program is Bay Area elected officials' strong endorsement of coordinated subregional planning and decision making to address the following issues:

- subregional development form: urban development strategy
- natural resource protection/management
- subregional mobility
- subregional jobs-housing balance
- housing supply and affordability
- coordinated planning among cities and with adjacent counties.

State and federal legislation already mandates certain subregional planning activities, such as the preparation and adoption of countywide Congestion Management, Solid Waste and Airport Land Use Plans. The Platform on Growth Management advocates integrating and expanding those efforts so that jurisdictions can address related land-use issues in a more comprehensive way. It recommends that state and regional agencies provide financial and other incentives to encourage local jurisdictions' participation in comprehensive subregional planning.

In undertaking this task, there are two overarching objectives. First, to ensure that local jurisdictions retain significant autonomy and have substantial flexibility in forming subregional alliances. Second, recognizing the fiscal constraints and other demands jurisdictions already face, to avoid creating another layer of government.

This paper identifies potential roles for subregional entities, and offers guideliness for facilitating comprehensive subregional planning and coordination. Recognizing that this process will take considerable time and effort to implement, it outlines how subregions might proceed in orderly phases over the next three years.

Potential Roles for Subregional Bodies

As a result of state and federal laws that mandate the adoption of a variety of countywide plans, every city and county in the Bay Area already participates in subregional planning. In addition, many jurisdictions have joined voluntarily with their neighbors to address issues of common concern. Examples of a few existing subregional efforts are highlighted in margins throughout this document Expanded information on two subregional bodies is contained in Appendix I.

Whether mandatory or voluntary, these efforts recognize that some issues transcend single jurisdictions and are resolved more effectively by inter-jurisdictional planning and cooperation. The Platform on Growth Management proposes a more comprehensive approach to subregional planning than is required by mandated single focus plans, or fostered by voluntary efforts.

Such an approach can help achieve state-set goals such as increasing housing supply and affordability, reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality, as well as local objectives such as preserving agriculture and fostering a strong economy. It also offers opportunities for neighboring jurisdictions to collaborate on creative and cost-effective ways to meet existing state requirements so effectively that new mandates can be modified or avoided.

As an example, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District has urged all cities and counties to prepare air quality elements for inclusion in their general plans. It would require local agencies to adopt air quality elements as a condition for delegation of a regional indirect source review control program they are considering. The District may be open, however, to having such elements prepared and adopted at the subregional rather than the local level. Conceivably, the existing cooperative relationship between ABAG, MTC and the District could be expanded to ensure that adequate guidance and financial resources are available to local agencies that agree to participate in producing and implementing a subregional air quality strategy.

Finally, improved cooperation at the subregional level has helped local jurisdictions provide necessary services in a more cost-effective way. As fiscal resources become more scarce, subregional bodies could help to stretch available funds by facilitating service coordination.

Examples of Existing Subregional Efforts

Alameda/Contra Costa Counties

Tri-Valley Council

Elected officials from the Town of Danville and the City of San Ramon in Contra Costa County, and the cities of Dublin, Livermore and Pleasanton in Alameda County formed the Tri-Valley Council to address planning issues of common concern. An early emphasis on transportation resulted in the establishment of the Tri-Valley Transportation Council (TVTC), a joint powers agreement that includes the five cities and two counties. TVTC is currently working on a transportation plan to integrate and coordinate its members various transportation planning efforts. The Tri-Valley Council recently worked with Senator Boatwright on a bill that would permit cities to pool and redistribute fair share housing allocations.

Contra Costa County

Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA)

CCTA manages the Growth Management Program created in 1988 by voter approval of Measure C (C-88) which established a one-half percent sales tax increase to pay for transportation-related capital improvements and programs. C-88 requires that jurisdictions add Growth Management Elements to their General Plans and participate in joint planning with neighboring jurisdictions. CCTA monitors compliance and certifies each jurisdiction's elegibility for a share of C-88 sales tax revenues.

Guidelines For Subregional Coordination

These guidelines respond to three potential areas of subregional planning activity. First, they consider the Platform's directive that subregional planning bodies be established, according to the desires of each subregion, to develop strategies that address certain specific land use planning issues. Second, they recognize that subregions may elect to address other concerns of common interest. Finally, they stress subregional planning as a tool for addressing existing and future state and federal requirements.

Every subregion has unique characteristics and needs. Therefore, instead of creating a static or generic model that may have relevance for no one, this proposal offers flexible guidelines. It identifies key actions, considers relevant issues , and suggests approaches jurisdictions might take as they establish subregional planning bodies.

Key Actions

1. Designating a subregional planning body
2. Developing an organizational structure for subregional planning
3. Developing goals and objectives
4. Establishing a self-evaluation and monitoring process
5. Creating mechanisms for conflict resolution

Implementation

1. Designating a subregional planning body

The Platform directs each subregion to designate a subregional planning body whose primary responsibility will be to develop or facilitate the development of strategies that address the six issues identified in the Platform on Growth Management. Subregional planning bodies may also prepare and adopt state mandated plans, and serve as agents for inter-jurisdictional coordination, cooperation and conflict resolution. In addition, they will be the bridge between local jurisdictions and regional agencies.

Marin County

Marin Countywide Planning Agency (MCPA)

MCPA was formed in 1990 by a Joint Powers Agreement between the County and ten of its cities in anticipation of voter approval of a program similar to Contra Costa's Measure C. Though the ballot measure failed, MCPA continued to operate. It was designated as Marin's Congestion Management Agency, has developed and maintains a countywide transportation computer model, and is working with the County to update the Countywide General Plan. The Governing Body includes one County Supervisor, and one Councilmember from each participating City and Town.

Napa County

Napa Valley Housing Authority (NVHA)

The NVHA operates under a Joint Powers Agreement between the Napa County , Yountville, Calistoga, St. Helena and American Canyon Housing Authorities. It has become both a forum for discussing and the catalyst for coordinating countywide housing policy development. Created to provide housing for low income families, including farm worker and emergency housing, NVHA has also produced a joint city/county jobs-housing study, and is working to develop countywide inclusionary zoning and industry-housing linkage programs.

Designating an established agency as the subregional planning body has a great deal of appeal. In all of the discussions about improving regional and subregional governance the need to simplify and coordinate rather than to add new agencies has been a recurring theme. Additionally, agencies established to address state mandates are more likely to have the funding necessary to support staff and operations.

On the other hand, many existing bodies already have a clear and compelling legal mandate that requires ongoing attention and commitment. The Platform on Growth Management may require a more comprehensive approach than existing bodies presently take. Existing bodies generally represent one county. Some newly defined subregions will not correspond geographically with a single county's boundaries.

Approach I

Create an umbrella or oversight body to address the land-use planning issues identified in the Platform on Growth Management and work with other subregional bodies such as CMAs and LAFCOs.

This approach would strive to coordinate, minimize overlap and ensure consistency of activities at the subregional level. It might also work toward eventual consolidation of all subregional planning functions. Because it would serve as the bridge between local jurisdictions and regional agencies, jurisdictions might consider including their regional agency representatives on this subregional board.

Approach II

Expand the authority, responsibilities, expertise and focus of an existing body, such as the Congestion Management Agency (CMA), and redesignate it as the subregional planning body.

San Mateo County

San Mateo County City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG)

C/CAG was formed in 1990 by a Joint Powers Agreement between the County and 19 of its 20 cities. Board members include one elected official and one alternate appointed by each of the participating jurisdictions. Ex-officio members include the County Superintendent of Schools. An Administrative Steering Committee composed of the County Manager, Sam Trans General Manager, and three City Managers currently provides staff assistance.

C/CAG's primary purpose is to prepare, adopt, monitor and enforce Congestion Management, Airport Land Use and other countywide state-mandated plans. Its Board also serves as the Airport Land Use Commission, manages AB 434 funds, and is considering administering the County's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Program.

2. Developing an organizational structure for subregional planning

Two primary structures have to be established: a governing or policy making board and staffing support. In addition, subregions may want to consider having one or more issue-oriented ancillary bodies, such as citizens' or technical advisory committees.

Governing Board

In establishing a governing board, questions to be addressed include: Which jurisdictions will participate (e.g. cities and counties only, or some/all special districts)? Will all members be elected officials? Will all board members vote, or will some be in an advisory capacity? Will each jurisdiction have one board position, or will membership be determined by population size? Should special voting rules be established for extraordinary or controversial situations?

The size and composition of the governing board could vary with the issues the subregional body is organized to address. For mandated planning activities, particularly those that affect the disbursement of funds, jurisdictions will likely be guided by the one person-one vote rule. Criteria for establishing a body to deal with a discretionary activity, such as an agreement among three jurisdictions to jointly develop a recreation area, may be less stringent.

Approach

Developing and adopting mandated plans, and carrying out comprehensive subregional land use planning strategies are policy-making activities. These are best addressed by a governing board comprised solely of elected officials from each city and county within the subregion's geographic boundaries. The size of the board, the number of representatives from each jurisdiction, and how they are appointed will be determined by each subregion. If each jurisdiction has one representative, an extraordinary, population-based voting procedure may need to be established for dealing with controversies.

Santa Clara County

Santa Clara County Planning Policy Committee (PPC)

The PPC was formed to facilitate coordination and cooperatio between the fifteen cities and the County. The Urban Development and Open Space Subcommittee of the PPC, was created in the early 1970's to address countywide urban development issues. It produced the Urban Growth Management Strategy which established that all urban development should occur in the cities. The Strategy was adopted by the County, the 15 cities and LAFCO, all of whom continue to operate under this program.

South County Joint Area Planning Committee

Santa Clara County and the cities of Gilroy and Morgan Hill have adopted a mutual statement of policies for community development and environmental management. The plan addresses diverse issues such as urban growth and development, job/housing balance, agricultural preservation, open space and recreation, and transportation.

The governing board could establish, as needed, standing or ad hoc committees to advise on technical, social, economic and other significant topics. Members could include city or county managers, planning and public works directors, school and special district officials, representatives of business, agriculture, the environment, and the public.

Staffing Support

The success of the subregional planning bodies' efforts will depend to a large degree on the staffing and financial resources available to support it. Two approaches are suggested. In either approach, comprehensive planning skills are essential. It is assumed that the regional agencies staff would work actively with subregional staff to provide needed tools and services under either approach.

Approach I

Establish a cooperative agreement whereby all member jurisdictions will assign staff to undertake designated subregional planning tasks.

Approach II

Establish a separate subregional planning staff, jointly funded by all member jurisdictions, that is dedicated to this activity.

3. Developing goals and objectives

Acting on the General Assembly's directive, subregional planning bodies will formulate goals and objectives to guide the development of subregional strategies in future phases of the planning process. These goals and objectives will address issues identified in the Platform on Growth Management, and will also relate to achievement of state and regional goals delineated in congestion management, clean air, housing and other programs.

Solano County

Tri-City and County Regional Park and Open Space Group

Under the terms of this joint powers agreement, Solano County and the cities of Fairfield, Vallejo, and Benicia work jointly for the protection of open space in the area generally bounded by Highways 80, 680 and 780. The JPA includes the potential for joint development of recreational facilities.

Solano City-County Coordinating Council

The Council includes representatives of the County and each of the cities. It is seeking solutions to county financing concerns that stem, in part, from the 1984 approval of Proposition A. This measure required that future development occur within cities. This has limited the county's ability to generate property and sales tax revenues needed to finance capital facilities such as jails and hospitals. One proposed solution would be an agreement by the cities to levy a development fee that would go to the County to help finance capital facilities such as jails and hospitals.

Jurisdictions are also expected to form ad hoc subregional affiliations to resolve specific mutual concerns. In such cases, the identification of common goals and objectives is likely to stimulate the establishment of a sub-regional alliance formed to meet those particular needs. In either case, subregional bodies should seek community input by establishing broad-based, interactive public information and participation programs.

Sonoma County

The Planning Directors in Sonoma County have been meeting monthly to coordinate efforts and share ideas. Initially established to address housing element certification, the group has begun to look at other topics, such as preservation of community separators, and protection of agriculture and open space.

4. Establishing a self-evaluation and monitoring process

Establishing a self-evaluation program can help local jurisdictions and subregional planning bodies evaluate their status with regard to the six issues identified in the Platform on Growth Management, and other goals and objectives. The program could begin when preliminary goals and objectives are established and be used as a means of monitoring progress in future phases of the subregional planning process. A similar program could be established between the subregional planning bodies and regional agencies. It could eventually be replaced by a self-certification/ compliance program.

5. Creating mechanisms for conflict resolution

Principle 11 of the Platform on Growth Management states: "Conflict resolution mechanisms are needed during plan formulation and to negotiate compromise when jurisdictions disagree about such issues as appropriate mitigation for project impacts, facility siting, etc. The resolution process should stress early negotiation (conflict avoidance). Conflicts should be resolved at the lowest level possible: first among disputing agencies, second by a subregional body and finally by the regional planning body."

In developing conflict resolution mechanisms, the following issues need to be resolved:

- Can the subregional body require that disputing jurisdictions participate in conflict resolution, or must the parties agree to/request it?
- At what point in a dispute will conflict resolution begin, and what is the recommended schedule for completing the process?

Table 1

Implementing Comprehensive Subregional Planning In The San Francisco Bay Area

A Preliminary Schedule

A recent review of existing subregional planning efforts indicates that developing and implementing multi-jurisdictional comprehensive planning programs will be a complicated process. For this reason, a phased approach is recommended.

Phase one is currently underway. To ensure a smooth transition into future phases, this preliminary schedule for the development and implementation of a comprehensive subregional planning program is offered for review and comment. It groups tasks into four phases, and suggests time frames for completing each phase.

Phase One - Setting The Groundrules — **9 months**

- Develop guidelines to facilitate the establishment of subregional planning bodies.
- Determine the tools needed to support subregional efforts.
- Consider/analyze the resources and incentives available to local, subregional and regional agencies.
- Differentiate the roles of local jurisdictions, subregions and regional agencies.

Phase Two - Building A Framework For Action — **12 months**

- Develop broad planning and administrative guidelines all subregions will agree to follow.
- Designate subregional planning bodies.
- Establish administrative support structure for managing subregional planning.
- Adopt conflict resolution procedures within each subregion and between two or more subregions.
- Establish and advocate for incentives .

Phase Three - Developing Subregional Strategies — **18 months**

- Adopt land use goals and objectives.
- Evaluate current status.
- Develop strategies, policies and implementation programs.
- Establish a self-evaluation process.

Phase Four - Implementing the Program — **Ongoing**

- Establish initial and recurring self-certification processes.
- Activate incentive programs.
- Improve/develop monitoring systems.

APPENDIX I

Existing Subregional Efforts: A Closer Look At Two Examples

Contra Costa County Transportation Authority (CCTA)

Introduction

CCTA was established by the Mayors' Conference and the Board of Supervisors in accordance with State Law (SB 142). It manages the Growth Management Program established in 1988 by voter approval of Measure C. The program's overall goal is to address the impacts of growth through cooperative planning and consensus building. CCTA has also been designated as Contra Costa County's Congestion Management Agency.

Measure C established a one-half percent sales tax increase to pay for transportation-related capital improvements and programs. It requires that all jurisdictions in the County take a variety of actions. CCTA is responsible for monitoring compliance and certifying each jurisdiction's eligibility for a share of relevant sales tax revenues.

Administrative Code

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority Administrative Code (Code) prescribes the composition powers, and duties of the governing board, quorum and voting requirements for action by the board, the procedure for appointing and duties of the Executive Director, and the establishment of various committees. This report provides an overview of CCTA by briefly summarizing the sections of the Code that cover these subject areas.

Board Composition

The Board consists of 11 members, all of whom must be elected officials. The representation is as follows:

- Two representatives from the Board of Supervisors.
- One representative from the Conference of Mayors.
- Two representatives each from the four Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs-see below).

Regional Transportation Planning Committees

RTPCs were established for the central, east, west and southwest county regions to develop transportation plans for their areas. These plans are incorporated into the countywide transportation plan. Members includes elected officials from each city as well as the member(s) of the Board Supervisor representing the area. RTPCs may also include planning commissioners as well as representatives from other public bodies and special interest groups.

Powers and Duties of the Governing Board

The Board's primary responsibility is to administer the Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Expenditure Plan. This includes providing for the design, financing and construction of approved projects, and determining the use of revenues.

In addition, the Board can enter into contracts, employ an Executive Director and staff, acquire, hold, or dispose of property, incur debts, and apply for grants under federal, state or local programs. As the Congestion Management Agency for Contra Costa County, CCTA's Board also adopts the County's Congestion Management Program.

Quorum and Voting Requirements

With the exception of amendments affecting the sales tax increase, which require a vote of the electorate, and amendments to the expenditure plan which must follow the provisions of the Local Transportation Authority Improvement Act, all official acts require the affirmative vote of a majority of the Board members. Proposed amendments to the growth management ordinance established by Measure C must be submitted to the RTPCs for review and action, and must be approved by two-thirds of the Board.

Executive Director and Staff

CCTA has a full-time Executive Director who is an officer of the Authority, and has full charge of the administration of its day-to-day business affairs. The Executive Director duties include serving as the Secretary and Treasurer of the Authority, enforcing all rules, regulations, ordinances, policies, procedures and resolutions, and administering the personnel system. CCTA employs its own staff.

Board, Standing and Advisory Committees

The code establishes four Board Committees (Administrative; Planning and Governmental Affairs; Projects and Programs; and Executive), four Regional Transportation Planning Committees (see below), the Transportation Partnership Advisory Committee (citizens' advisory committee), and a Technical Coordinating Committee. The latter includes representatives from the City and County Engineers Advisory Committee, Caltrans and the MTC, as well as city managers and transit operators.

San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG)

Introduction

C/CAG was created by a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) to address diverse issues that transcend political boundaries within San Mateo County. Nineteen of San Mateo's twenty cities joined the County in establishing the JPA. C/CAG's primary purpose is to prepare, adopt, monitor and enforce the following state-mandated plans:

- Congestion Management
- Integrated Solid Waste Management
- Airport Land Use
- Hazardous Waste Management

The Association's Board serves as the Congestion Management Agency and the Airport Land Use Commission and is Program Manager for AB 434 funds. In addition, subcommittees have been established to address issues such as the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System program requirements and regional governance.

Joint Powers Agreement

The JPA establishing C/CAG prescribes the composition, purposes and activities of the Board of Directors, voting procedures, budgeting and financing processes, and staffing arrangements. Each of these is briefly summarized below.

Board Composition

C/CAG's Board consists of one Councilmember of each participating City and one member of the Board of Supervisors. In addition, there are four non-voting *ex-officio* members: the County Superintendent of Schools; a member of the San Francisco Airport Commission; a member of the San Mateo County Transit District Board; and a member of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority.

Purposes and Activities

As noted, the primary purpose is to review, adopt and monitor state-mandated countywide plans. C/CAG is also empowered to: perform such additional county-wide planning activities as approved or directed by two-thirds of the members representing two-thirds of the County's population.

Voting Procedures

C/CAG's members are committed to consensus following full discussion. If consensus cannot be reached, the JPA establishes the following voting procedures:

- A quorum shall consist of at least a majority of voting members and is required for all C/CAG meetings.

- All decisions and actions shall be by majority vote of those present unless the decisions involve the adoption of a countywide plan or any one member requests the use of the special voting procedures described below.

Special Voting Procedures

Special voting procedures shall be utilized at the request of any one member and for the final adoption of countywide plans. Under these circumstances, for a motion to be successful it must receive the votes of a majority of the members representing a majority of the population of the County. The Board may adjust by resolution the population figures set forth in the JPA at any time based on the decennial federal census or population figures provided by the State Department of Finance.

Budget and Finance

The Board must adopt by October 1 of each year an operating budget for C/CAG setting forth anticipated expenses, financing sources and proposed service levels necessary to carry out the purposes of the JPA. Once the budget is approved, the Board recommends the budget to the governing bodies of each member for the purpose of securing from them contributions and/or appropriations in accordance with the formula set forth in the JPA.

Each member's contribution is its pro-rata share of the revenue needed for the annual budget. Pro-rata shares are based upon each member's 1990 population, as adjusted from time to time. By use of the special voting procedures under special circumstances the Board may waive contributions. If a member fails to pay its annual contribution, it forfeits its voting rights.

Executive Director and Staff

The JPA authorizes the Board to employ an Executive Director who shall be responsible for C/CAG's day-to-day administration, including employing administrative staff. The Director shall be advised by an administrative steering committee comprised of the County Manager, Sam Trans General Manager and three City Managers chosen by the City Manager's Association. Prior to the recent appointment of a half-time Director, this committee provided necessary staff assistance and administrative support. C/CAG is authorized to employ personnel, and, utilize existing County, Sam Trans or City staff (providing that these agencies agree), or retain professional consultants to perform any necessary staff work.

Menu of Subregional Land Use Policies

In 1992, elected officials representing cities and counties from all parts of the region adopted a set of principles guiding the future structure of Bay Area growth management coordination. These principles called for local jurisdictions to expand their interjurisdictional planning efforts, designate subregional planning bodies, and prepare development and conservation strategies related to certain subjects. These subjects include:

1. Location and intensity of urban development.

2. Natural resource protection and management .

3. Mobility by automobile, transit, and nonmotorized means.

4 Adequate housing supply and affordability.

5. Economic vitality.

A "menu" of subregional land use policies addressing the above issues is offered here. This menu is designed to encourage consideration of a wide range of possible approaches and policy choices while allowing them to be tailored to individual subregions.

The individual policies are intended as generic examples that could be modified to suit local conditions. Sub-headings are included for convenience, to group policies that address similar objectives. Local officials are encouraged to mix and modify policies in this menu, and to incorporate their own innovations in developing a comprehensive program that meets the diverse needs and desires of their subregion.

Policies are arranged in three categories: *Basic, Moderate,* and *Dynamic.* The *Basic* category presents policies which, if adopted by a subregion, would indicate that local jurisdictions are "on-board" in fostering a comprehensive conservation and development strategy. The *Moderate* category includes policies that would commit localities to pursue innovative approaches to coordinated conservation and development. The *Dynamic* category includes policies that call for a creative and significant commitment to interjurisdictional land use coordination.

A SUBREGIONAL LAND USE POLICY MENU

LOCATION AND INTENSITY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

ISSUES

Addressing the future form of urban development is key to developing a viable subregional strategy. By first determining the overall location and intensity of urban development, subregions build a foundation on which to base other more specific policies.

OBJECTIVES

There are three main objectives in developing a desired urban form:

1. Ensure that the cumulative effect of new development emphasizes a compact city-centered subregional pattern to:
   a. support existing urban centers, large and small;
   b. improve mobility of people, goods and information;
   c. optimize efficient public infrastructure which minimizes environmental costs; and
   d. protect agriculture, open space and other natural resources.
   e. support economic activity.

2. Maintain adequate performance standards and levels of service for infrastructure, amenities, transportation and public services provided by municipalities or special districts within the subregion.

3. Optimize maintenance and use of existing infrastructure while pursuing more efficient and less costly technologies.

MENU OF POLICIES

The following subregional policies are intended to achieve an efficient and desirable urban development form.

Urban Growth Boundaries

Basic

1. Encourage firm urban growth boundaries that enable achievement of objectives for housing, jobs and other development and for the conservation of agriculture, environmentally sensitive and other open space lands.

2. Encourage urban development inside urban growth boundaries while discouraging it outside such boundaries by establishing development incentives and preservation criteria.

Moderate

3. Establish urban growth boundaries and designate an adequate amount, range and density of land use within these boundaries to meet projected needs.

4. Establish and permit only appropriate land uses outside urban growth boundaries, possibly including public parks and recreation areas, open space, privately-operated recreation areas and agricultural uses.

5. Pursue urban uses near urban growth boundaries that are compatible with activities outside urban growth boundaries.

Dynamic

6. Establish an urban growth plan for the subregion that defines areas within urban growth boundaries suitable for varying levels and intensities of urban development, designates which development should occur first, and develops a hierarchy of areas for subsequent development.

7. Designate as greenbelt all lands beyond urban growth boundaries and protect such lands through open space zoning, joint agreements and, where necessary, acquisition, to ensure greenbelt uses are appropriate.

Annexation and Urban Expansion

Basic

8. Encourage annexations that conform to an orderly expansion of city boundaries within planned urban growth areas and provide for a contiguous development pattern.

Moderate

9. Develop vacant or underutilized land within existing city limits whenever and wherever possible, prior to an extension of development outside of incorporated areas.

Dynamic

10. Establish criteria for evaluating proposed annexations of land to cities which assure that:

a. the land is within urban growth boundaries;
b. water, sewer, police, fire, and school services have adequate capacity;
c. the land within incorporated areas is unsuitable or insufficient to meet current land use needs;
d. the land abuts incorporated areas or existing or planned city streets on at least one side; and
e. the land is not under an agricultural preserve or open space contract.

11. Work with LAFCO to add the above criteria to those required by existing state law.

Infrastructure

Basic

12. Encourage growth to be directed to where infrastructure capacity is available or committed including, but not limited to, road, transit, water, solid waste disposal and sewage treatment.

13. Encourage interjurisdictional cooperation to eliminate costly duplication of capital infrastructure, public facilities and services.

14. Encourage cost-effective maintenance of existing public facilities and services as well as new investment to keep up with demand and achieve subregional objectives.

15. Discourage "leap frog" development by programming the extension of water and sewer lines only to areas contiguous with existing development.

Moderate

16. Invest in major public facilities and urban amenities that support the further development of urban centers.

17. Ensure that special purpose districts and other service providers have capacity and will provide in a timely manner necessary services where the subregion agrees that development is planned or expected.

18. Pursue efforts to combine special districts to service subregional areas where efficiencies will result.

19. Establish and maintain levels of service and recommended standards for various components of the subregional infrastructure.

Dynamic

20. Phase and limit extension of urban services within urban growth boundaries.

21. Identify needed public facilities of regional and subregional significance, and assure that new development planning and approval is accompanied by firm commitments to provide such infrastructure.

22. Coordinate development of long range policies and capital improvement programs of all levels of government and special districts to ensure that infrastructure and services support achievement of subregional objectives through the timely and cost-effective provision of public facilities and services.

23. Adopt development mitigation programs to ensure that new development meets subregional objectives and pays its fair share of the cost of providing police, fire, parks, water, sewer and flood control facilities and services.

Land Use and Development Intensity

Basic

24. Encourage employment, commercial and social activities to be located close together to help contain growth and reduce the need for travel.

25. Encourage higher density residential development to be located within convenient walking distance of downtowns and near major office developments, retail centers or transportation centers.

Moderate

26. Establish minimum densities in areas designated as high density, areas designated for redevelopment, and in areas with existing infrastructure capacity able to handle growth.

Dynamic

27. Develop incentive programs to encourage infill, redevelopment and reuse of vacant and underutilized parcels within existing urban areas.

28. Implement programs to identify and overcome potential difficulties associated with redevelopment and infill, such as on-site toxics in industrial areas and neighborhood opposition .

NATURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT

ISSUES

As the Bay Area has grown, so have concerns for maintaining air and water quality, protecting open space, ensuring the availability of land for parks and wildlife preserves and retaining agricultural activities.

OBJECTIVES

There are six main objectives in considering adequate protection of natural resources and our environment:

1. Protect environmental resources in order to maintain and enhance ecological health and diversity of plant and animal communities.

2. Preserve economically productive lands, including crop and grazing land and forests.

3. Ensure availability of open lands for public purposes, including recreation and watershed protection.

4. Create and enhance community identity through protection of community separators, hillsides, ridgelines and viewsheds, and key landscape features.

5. Use conservation of open land to guide needed and anticipated new development intoareas where it is best provided for, avoiding areas of high risk of landslide, flood, fire or other natural hazard.

6 Preserve and enhance air and water quality.

MENU OF POLICIES

The following subregional policies are intended to improve natural resource protection and management.

Conservation of Ecological Resources

Basic

1. Inventory and encourage preservation of significant plant communities and wildlife habitats and movement corridors as well as significant historic, visual and cultural resources, including views, landmarks and archaeological.

2. Carry out requirements of state and federal legislation protecting endangered species.

Moderate

3. Pursue programs which identify and protect the availability of significant rock, sand, gravel and other mineral resource areas and which balance their use with ecological conservation objectives.

4. Pursue the use of conservation easements, density transfer or purchase using in-lieu fees and dedications in order to preserve open space that cannot otherwise be protected.

5. Establish a non-profit land trust to acquire and preserve open space.

6. Pursue all methods of acquiring land for parks, permanent easements, and open space preserves that contribute to the subregional open space network from state and federal governments, individuals, and foundations.

Dynamic

7 Permanently preserve a continuous system of open space adjacent to urban growth boundaries, through planning enforcement, joint agreements and/or acquisition.

8. Develop proposal for new funding for special open space acquisition program considering bonds, parcel, sales and other taxes and fees.

9. Require dedications of all lands needed for maintaining and improving animal movement corridors; establish zoning to ensure long term viability of large scale plant and animal habitats

10. Require conservation and, where necessary, restoration of all riparian habitat to support historic levels of wildlife and plants.

Preservation of Agricultural Resources

Basic

11. Discourage the conversion of agricultural lands not currently used for farming, but which have soils or other characteristics which make them suitable for farming, in a way that would preclude future agricultural use.

Moderate

12. Retain land in large, contiguous blocks of sufficient size and quality to enable economically viable grazing or agriculture.

13. Protect and enhance the economic viability of agricultural land by: facilitating preservation agreements, conservation easements, and transfer of development rights; establishing right to farm ordinances,; and undertaking public education about agriculture.

Dynamic

14. Identify and protect any watershed lands that are part of an agricultural production area.

15. Define agricultural production zones for all significant crop and grazing uses and permanently prohibit any development or subdivision of land in those zones.

16. Require the establishment of buffer zones in all developed areas next to agricultural production zones, in order to reduce urban-farm conflicts.

Protection of Community Character

Basic

17 Encourage actions which maintain the integrity of hillside areas as major scenic and natural resources by limiting development to low-intensity uses compatible with open space.

Moderate

18. Direct future urban development away from areas that have steep hillsides and that are adjacent to major water courses.

19. Define and establish long term planning goals that encourage large scale urban separators between communities (which have not already grown together).

Dynamic

20. Preserve hillside areas of at least 15% average slope by discouraging higher density development, encouraging clustering, requiring open space preservation and ensuring the protectin of natural features such as trees, creeks, knolls, ridgelines and rock outcroppings.

21. Establish a dedication and acquisition program to acquire community separator lands.

Air Quality

Basic

22 Support the air district's development of improved ambient air quality monitoring capabilities and the establishment of standards, thresholds and rules to more adequately address the air quality impacts of proposed project plans and proposals.

23. Encourage modes of transportation that minimize impact on air quality.

Moderate

24 Adopt air quality policies and programs and integrate into local general plans and implementation mechanisms.

25. Promote ancillary employee services, such as child care, restaurants, banks, or convenience markets, at major employment centers to reduce vehicle trips.

Dynamic

26. Discourage single-occupant vehicle trips through parking supply and pricing controls or other measures.

27. Preserve rights-of-way and land for station sites along future transit corridors and secure adequate funding for transit agencies in the subregion to make transit a viable alternative to the automobile.

Water Quality

Basic

28 Carry out requirements of state and federal legislation protecting wetlands; where there is discretion, discourage any filling of wetlands except for small levees, piers or walkways necessary for public use or study of the shoreline or baylands.

29 Encourage the preservation of adequate vegetative cover and prevent development which increases erosion and sedimentation potential along streams or in unstable soil areas.

30. Identify, protect and conserve groundwater.

Moderate

31. Retain natural riparian and stream-side areas in their natural state to prevent degradation and provide percolation, wildlife habitat, aesthetic relief, and recreational uses.

Dynamic

32. Establish actions which protect water resources by:

    a. preserving areas with prime percolation capabilities and preventing placement of all potential sources of pollution in such areas;
    b. minimizing sedimentation and erosion through control of grading, quarrying, cutting of trees, vegetation removal, placement of roads and bridges, use of off-road vehicles and animal-related disturbances of soil;
    c. controlling pollution from land uses producing potentially harmful substances or contaminants; and
    d. preventing establishment of excessive concentrations of septic systems over large land areas and mitigating water quality impacts from existing concentrations.

MOBILITY

ISSUES

Land use is often adapted to the types of transportation that are available. When the choice of transportation modes is limited or lacking, the result can be to hinder or steer development in an unbalanced or undesirable way. Reliance on the auto for all trips increases the number of cars on the road, which in turn increases congestion and air pollution.

OBJECTIVES

There are four main objectives to consider in providing adequate mobility:

1. Create an efficient cost-effective multi-modal transportation system by focusing investment and development in designated transportation corridors.

2. Integrate land use and transportation planning in order to ensure land use and supporting transportation patterns that facilitate safe, convenient and reasonably priced mobility of people and goods, and increased use of transit.

3. Discourage long-distance, single-occupant automobile commuting while increasing resident access to employment, shopping, and recreation by transit or other alternatives to single-occupant vehicle use in order to reduce congestion, time lost to travel, and air pollution.

4. Provide more streamlined transit service by establishing a unified and coordinated transit network consisting of all transportation agencies in the Bay Area.

MENU OF POLICIES

The following subregional policies are intended to achieve improved mobility.

Transit-Centered Development

Basic

1. Encourage transit-compatible infill development or redevelopment near transit stations in central business districts, and intensify suburban business parks to create destination density bases for transit.

Moderate

2. Promote pedestrian-oriented mixed-use centers , including residential, commercial and employment activities, easily accessible by foot, bicycle, or transit, to reduce the need for multiple long-distance auto trips.

3. Promote pedestrian activities in the immediate vicinity of transit stations by providing safe, direct, attractive pedestrian access between transit stations and neighboring development.

Dynamic

4. Establish higher residential and commercial densities along transit routes and roadway arterials, near transit stops, transportation hubs and activity centers, and as part of mixed-use developments.

5. Establish highest intensity office and other employment uses within convenient walking distance (1/4 mile) of existing or planned transit stations or transportation hubs to promote transit use, optimize transit investments and reduce the adverse auto impacts of development.

6. Designate a hierarchy of housing and commercial densities that varies based on proximity to transit stations and corridors, with the highest densities located within convenient walking distance of transit stations and bus lines, and densities decreasing as distance from existing or planned transit service increases.

7. Establish incentives such as sliding scale development fee schedules that favor higher density transit-oriented development in order to discourage low density sprawl and encourage the production of transit-oriented development.

Auto-Oriented Development

Moderate

8. Discourage the development or expansion of major commercial, office and institutional centers in areas not adequately served by transit.

9. Discourage projects that generate more than a set threshold of automobile traffic or exceed certain levels of service on local streets and arterials in areas not served by existing or future transit.

Mixed Land Use

Basic

10. Encourage neighborhood-serving commercial uses within walking distance (1/4 mile) of defined residential areas.

11. Encourage local policies which promote and do not unnecessarily restrict home-based work opportunities.

Moderate

12. Promote mixed-use development that provides opportunities for residents to live and work in the same neighborhood or community.

Dynamic

13. Facilitate the conversion of underused industrial sites for residential, mixed use or live/work use.

14. Establish small scale neighborhood telecommuting centers that provide fax machines, telephones, computers with networking capabilities, and other office equipment, allowing workers to work close to home.

Non-Auto Use Through Site Design

Basic

15. Encourage transit connections between residential areas, commercial areas, and centers of employment.

16. Encourage bicycle and pedestrian connections between employment centers and nearby personal services such as restaurants, stores, post offices and banks.

17. Encourage direct, safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle routes on residential streets in new subdivisions to provide convenient connections within neighborhoods and access to bus and rail service.

Moderate

18. Promote road networks and circulation patterns within subdivisions with multiple access points and other amenities that readily accommodate public transportation vehicles.

19. Promote pedestrian and bicycle connections within residential neighborhoods and between residential areas and nearby transit stations or stops, commercial areas, centers of employment, and schools.

Dynamic

20. Establish design guidelines that emphasize safe, attractive streetscapes in developments near transit and that maximize pedestrian and bicycle access to transit.

HOUSING SUPPLY AND AFFORDABILITY

ISSUES

The lack of an adequate supply of housing in the Bay Area is widely recognized. Strategies are needed to improve the supply and affordability of needed housing.

A locality that restricts or severely limits housing may cause spill-over effects into neighboring communities. Greater cooperation between communities can relieve tensions and serve the larger goal of providing an adequate supply of housing affordable to all the region's residents.

OBJECTIVES

There are three major objectives in considering adequate housing:

1. Promote fair and equal access to housing for all persons regardless of race, color, religion, gender, disability, sexual orientation, age, national origin, or family status.

2. Strengthen interjurisdictional efforts to ensure a fair, equitable and rational distribution of low-income, moderate-income and special needs housing throughout the region and subregion consistent with land use policies, transportation services and employment locations.

3. Facilitate the development of affordable housing near areas with superior transit service.

MENU OF POLICIES

The following subregional policies are intended to encourage adequate housing supply and affordability.

Increasing Housing Supply

Basic

1. Encourage the designation of land near transit for multi-family housing and neighborhood-serving uses.

2. Encourage the development of special housing facilities, including small community care facilities for the elderly, mentally disabled, and dependent or neglected children, in residential and mixed-use zones near transit and other services.

Moderate

3. Promote the provision of a range of unit sizes, types and lot designs in major new developments.

4. Promote residential development at or above the midpoint of the designated density range and discourage development at densities lower than the minimum density prescribed for each residential land use category.

5. Promote the development of second units, and allow shared housing among unrelated adults in single family residential areas.

6. Designate vacant office and industrial sites for residential use and encourage the reuse of older commercial or industrial buildings for residential or live-work space.

7. Promote a variety of techniques for increasing the supply of housing such as:
   a. incentives for development of multi-family housing with units large enough to accommodate families with children;
   b. mixed use developments that combine residential uses with compatible commercial and industrial uses;
   c. using air rights to construct housing over parking lots, etc.;
   d. minimum density levels;
   e. designating land for residential and workplace mixed use developments; and
   f. provide incentives and develop guidelines for constructing residential uses above ground floor commercial establishments.

Dynamic

8. Establish employer participation programs and offer incentives to encourage employers to contribute in some way to housing that is affordable to its workers (sites, fees, actual units).

Increasing Housing Affordability

Basic

9. Encourage coordinated local effort to jointly designate specific sites, including vacant buildings, for the provision of temporary homeless shelters, transitional housing, and housing for seasonal workers and to investigate private and public sources of funding for such facilities.

10. Encourage the development of programs, such as joint development of affordable units by two or more localities, designed to provide housing for very low-, low- and moderate-income households.

11. Encourage the construction and preservation of second dwelling units in single-family residential neighborhoods.

12. Establish a public/private partnership to ensure mutual understanding of subregional housing needs and practices of the development and finance market and to develop ways to improve housing production and lower housing costs.

Moderate

13. Promote programs whereby new residential projects involving demolition of moderate- or low-priced single family homes include an equal number of equivalently priced units in any replacement development, and ensure that previous residents are given first priority for occupancy.

14. Promote the preservation of all existing affordable housing located near transit, and promote institutional and financial mechanisms to provide for additional affordable housing near all transit centers.

15. Promote the use of new manufactured homes to realize potential cost reductions in housing.

Dynamic

16. Establish an "inclusionary" program whereby new residential developments must provide a minimum percentage of units affordable to very-low or low income households, either on site or through the payment of in-lieu fees for the construction of affordable units.

17. Establish housing impact fees on all non-residential developments including office, retail, and industrial uses to be used to assist in providing affordable dwelling units.

ECONOMIC VITALITY

ISSUES

The entire Bay Area has been hit hard by an economic slowdown in recent years. Resolving this problem will depend in part on improvements in the national economy.

General economic conditions are compounded by state fiscal policies that cause local jurisdictions to "fiscalize" land use and compete for revenue-producing development. Coordinated efforts are needed to achieve fiscal reform and equitable distribution of economic opportunity. Other components of economic health include providing quality education, producing affordable housing, investing in transportation, and maintaining environmental quality.

OBJECTIVES

There are three main objectives to consider in developing strategies to strengthen economic vitality.

1. Retain and allow for the orderly expansion of existing businesses.

2. Attract new businesses.

3. Offset revenue-driven development through fiscal reform and interjurisdictional cooperation.

MENU OF POLICIES

The following subregional policies are intended to achieve economic vitality.

Basic

1. Develop a coordinated subregion-wide approach to economic development.

2. Encourage economic development which provides jobs at all income levels for residents of the subregion.

3. Develop strategies to ensure retention of existing employers.

4. Identify and mitigate, where appropriate, obstacles to the formation and expansion of local businesses.

5. Work to remove impediments to gainful employment, such as lack of transportation, child care, job training, vocational education, and other factors.

6. Improve cooperation between public agencies and private sector representatives, such as chambers of commerce, financial institutions, plant managers and business associations, in formulating economic development plans and programs.

7. Cooperate to develop sufficient housing in a range of sizes and prices to meet the needs of workers employed in the subregion and to ensure that prospective employers have a diverse local labor pool.

8. Locate housing near job centers, where feasible, to reduce the need for commuting and automobile use.

9. Encourage mixed use development that combines employment, retail and service facilities with housing to reduce the need for commuting and automobile use.

10. Encourage office and professional home occupations.

Moderate

11. Encourage through special programs, including financing, the expansion and attraction of small and medium size firms with good growth potential.

12. Protect existing and future businesses by discouraging encroachment by non-compatible uses in areas designated for commercial and industrial use.

13. Work with local jurisdictions and the business community to maintain and provide information about economic development for governmental agencies and the private sector.

Examples include:

A. An inventory of commercially and industrially zoned land and an estimate of its potential for employment.

B. A list of specific businesses and industries likely to provide jobs for subregional residents, and strategies for attracting them to locate in the subregion.

C. An analysis of the potential for redevelopment of marginally developed land or derelict facilities, and an inventory of sites.

D. Information on existing and pending development throughout the subregion for use by government, business groups and potential developers.

E. Information about public sector financing to facilitate the location of appropriate business with a focus on financing transportation, housing and necessary public improvements.

14. Monitor the absorption and availability of industrial land within the subregion to ensure a balanced supply of available land for all sectors, including industrial suppliers and services, and periodically assess the need to designate additional industrial land to achieve this end.

15. Identify appropriate sites, provide infrastructure, and facilitate development of telecommuting centers.

Dynamic

16. Facilitate expansion or, if necessary, relocation of existing businesses within the subregion.

17. Special-handle projects of economic significance.

18. Expedite development review for desirable employment generating projects.

19. Permit reuse of industrial properties (existing structures or land plus new facilities) without discretionary permits.

20. Develop subregion-wide strategy to expedite redevelopment of military bases.

21. Support/establish employment training and vocational education programs to ensure residents' skills meet the employers' current and projected needs.

- Conduct a survey to identify the labor force requirements and job training needs of current and anticipated future employers.

- Encourage cooperative efforts among school districts, community colleges and employers to offer appropriate classes and internships.

- Maintain an employment information clearinghouse.

21. Identify sites within the subregion suitable for mixed use development and develop strategies to expedite development, including sharing of on-site development costs and tax revenues, and provision of off-site infrastructure and services.

22. Develop recommendations and advocate for reform of state fiscal policies in order to offset revenue-driven land use plans and development programs.

Incentives

TO BE DEVELOPED IN CONJUNCTION WITH
MTC AND THE AIR DISTRICT

Incentives

TO BE DEVELOPED IN CONJUNCTION WITH MTC AND THE AIR DISTRICT

Urban Futures Simulation Model

Introduction

How can communities or subregions "try out" alternative land use policies and growth scenarios? How might a set of land use policies in one jurisdiction affect development patterns in an adjacent community? Are future land development patterns likely to resemble our intuitive mental images, once market forces intervene? The Urban Futures Simulation Model might shed light on these and related questions and serve as a tool in developing subregional land use strategies. This paper provides a brief overview of how the model works and how it might assist planners and policy-makers, and includes suggestions for follow-up contacts.

To test the potential of the Urban Futures Model (UFM) as a tool for subregional planning, the Regional Planning Committee undertook a pilot study to evaluate the model in assessing alternative land use policies at the county level. Solano and Sonoma counties were chosen for the study based on the following criteria: both these counties are expected to experience significant new growth, both have significant natural resources which warrant protection, and the availability of maps and data.

Background

The UFM was developed at the Institute for Urban and Regional Development (IURD) at the University of California, Berkeley. The model uses ARC/INFO, a geographic information system, to create maps (visual pictures) of future development patterns, based on a set of development profitability assumptions.

Geographic information systems can be seen as a more sophisticated version of a planning approach pioneered by landscape architect Ian McHarg. McHarg advocated a technique whereby physical constraints (such as wetlands or steep slopes) are individually mapped on same-scaled transparencies which are then layered on top of one another. Areas with fewer constraints can then be more readily identified as appropriate for development. In the UFM, pertinent physical or policy features (such as current development status, general plan designation, or important farmland classification) which can be tied to parcel location are "digitized" and stored as data layers. Model inputs also reflect proximity to transportation and

infrastructure, with associated effects on development costs. Land can either be restricted from development at the outset, or it can become prohibitively expensive, from a developer's profitability standpoint.

Once all of the data layers have been digitized into files, an interactive menu program allows the user to specify variables such as: future population, maximum residential densities within and outside of incorporated areas, whether development must be restricted by general plan classifications, restrictions based on slope, etc. Using the tailored menu selections, together with the data layers and built-in developer profitability assumptions, the model creates a color map of future land use development patterns, as well as a data summary of the model allocations of population growth and land consumption. The resulting development patterns do not always match intuitive preconceptions.

How the Model Functions

UFM operates in four steps:

Step 1. The first step is to project residential demand using an econometric model of future population growth, based on historic trends, current city size and density and the availability of land (alternatively, local or other population forecasts can be "plugged in").

Step 2. The second step is to identify potential residential development sites by combining map-based data on resource constraints, zoning or General Plan designation, and proximity to roads and urban services. Also, planners can identify alternative policy constraints (for example, minimum or maximum densities or prohibition of development on prime agricultural lands).

Step 3. Future population growth is allocated to specific sites, consistent with the policy scenario being tested, and using a profit optimization approach. The idea is that a developer will select sites based on the maximum positive differential between housing production costs on any given site, compared to the expected sales price. The model ranks the profitability of all sites and then allocates growth first into the most profitable sites, and continues until all growth is allocated, or no more land (which could be profitably developed) is available.

Step 4. In the final step, another iteration is run to allocate that portion of the growth potential which could not be assigned in the first run (named "spillover" growth) to unincorporated areas with development potential.

An explicit intent of the model is to show how land use policies adopted in one community might impact other communities (within the subregion) and what the cumulative effect of either coordinated or uncoordinated policies might be.

The UFM does **not** include any forecasts for future non-residential demand or land use. Only residential demand is modeled.

Sample Model Dynamics

The test results for Solano County might shed light on the kinds of policies that can be modeled and possible results. Four alternative future scenarios were proposed, including continuation of agricultural protection policies and adherence to the General Plan designations, or a relaxation of these policies.

The model predicts that an extension of current agricultural protection policies would result in a subregional shift of development from Benicia and Suisun City (since these areas do not have sufficient land supply within their spheres of influence) to the cities of Vallejo, Fairfield, and Dixon. Thus we see that the policies, as modeled, could shift growth to the southwestern and northeastern sections of the county.

Under alternative scenarios that allowed a relaxation of the General Plan land use designations (for example, residential development was allowed to occur on commercially-designated parcels), local effects are variable. For example, in Benicia the opening up of commercial sites to residential development greatly reduced development pressures on agricultural lands. In contrast, the same policy scenario had little effect on the rate of growth and pattern of growth in Fairfield, Dixon and Suisun City.

How is the Model Unique?

The folks at U.C. Berkeley assert that the model is unusual in several respects. First, it is unique in that it forecasts at the metropolitan level, using a geographic information system for data integration and spatial analysis, as well as map display. This is in contrast with most projections, including ABAG's *Projections*, which do not identify specific future development parcels or sites (and therefore, cannot be readily mapped).

The UFM model is also unique in that it simulates the interaction between public regulatory policies and incorporates the profit calculations of private developers.

Once the model has been set up, permutations of alternative policy scenarios can be quickly and easily tested.

Hardware/Software Requirements

The mapping part of the project relies on Arc/Info software and operates on a Sun work station.

Follow-Up

Anyone interested in learning more might wish to review the following, or contact Professor John Landis at the Institute for Urban and Regional Development at U.C. Berkeley:

1. Final Report on the RPC Pilot Project (forthcoming from U.C. Berkeley).

2. Future Tense, *Planning*, the magazine of the American Planning Association; John D. Landis. February 1994.

   Note: In part, this article features ABAG's Solano/Sonoma pilot study.

3. How Shall We Grow? Alternative Futures for the Greater San Francisco Bay Region; John D. Landis. A California Policy Seminar Research Report; 1993.